

today, whether it should be provided for the record for legislative intent, that we don't remove this word from in front of "instrument" just because we think that it should be, when, in fact, it maybe should remain there. I think the legislative intent should say if prescription of an instrument is part of the intent of the law, then that should still remain, even though we remove the word. Now, if you would like to have the rest of my time, why you go right ahead.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Could I continue the discussion with you, Senator Dierks, on the point you just made?

SENATOR DIERKS: Sure.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What I am trying to get at is the point that either the physician performs the abortion or somebody who is not a physician. I don't believe there is any physician who has to get a prescription to obtain an instrument by which he or she will perform an abortion.

SENATOR DIERKS: That's true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I don't believe there is any instrument that somebody else is going to use that they need a prescription from a physician to obtain, so I am asking what instrument do you know that would be used in performing an abortion which is not obtainable except by a prescription from a physician?

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR DIERKS: Not being in the business, I don't know what they would be, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So that's why I'm saying, if we take "prescription" from in front of "instrument", we haven't really hurt anything because we've still got the use of an instrument or device. What I am trying to do, Senator Dierks, is separate these implements or instruments from these chemical substances. I don't want the same amount of fires of the two categories because they are different and perform different functions. I can see where the substances have to be prescribed.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay, then, I guess that my point would be that you want to divide it, yet I think the end result is the same, so if they produce the end result, I am not sure they need to be